1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

///

///

On October 20, 2011, the Petersons filed the underlying action against all defendants. Doc. #1, Exhibit 1. On October 18, 2012, the Petersons filed an amended complaint. Doc. #94. In response, defendants filed a series of motions to dismiss. Doc. ##102, 104. Thereafter, the Petersons filed the present motion for leave to file a second amended complaint. Doc. #112. II. **Discussion** A party may amend its pleadings after a responsive pleading has been filed by leave of court. FED. R. CIV. P. 15(a)(2). Leave of court to amend should be freely given when justice so requires and when there is no undue delay, bad faith, or dilatory motive on the part of the moving party. See Wright v. Incline Village General Imp. Dist., 597 F.Supp.2d 1191 (D. Nev. 2009); DCD Programs, LTD v. Leighton, 883 F.2d 183 (9th Cir. 1987). Here, the Petersons request leave to amend their complaint to add new allegations to their intentional infliction of emotional distress claim, as well as add additional claims for punitive damages. See Doc. #112. A copy of the proposed amended complaint is attached to the motion in accordance with LR 15-1. Doc. #112, Exhibit 1. The court finds that there is no undue delay, bad faith, or dilatory motive on behalf of the Petersons in requesting leave to amend their complaint. The court has also reviewed the proposed amended complaint and finds that it satisfies the pleading defects raised in the motions to dismiss. Further, the court finds that the matter is still early in litigation and that the defendants would not be prejudiced by allowing amendment. Accordingly, the court shall grant the Petersons' motion for leave to file an amended complaint. /// /// ///

1	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiffs' motion for leave to amend (Doc. #112) is
2	GRANTED. Plaintiffs shall have ten (10) days after entry of this order to file the amended
3	complaint attached as Exhibit 1 to their motion (Doc. #112).
4	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendants' motions to dismiss (Doc. ##102, 104) are
5	DENIED without prejudice.
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.
7	DATED this 4th day of June, 2013.  June, 2013.
8	000,000
9	LARRY R. HICKS
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	
26	